DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 516 SP 013 661

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Haubrich, Vernon |
| TITLE | Teachers, Money, and Schools. AFT Quest Paper #13. |
| SPONS AGENCY | American Federation of Teachers, Washington, D.C. |
| PUB DATE | 20 Apr 73 |
| NOTE | 26p. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO, 11 Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036 (No. QP-13; $1.00) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Community Attitudes; Economic Factors; *Educational Finance; *Educational Objectives; *Political Socialization; School Integration; *School Role; *Social Attitudes; Teacher Responsibility |

ABSTRACT

A critical examination of the role of the school in the community and the impact of community expectations of the school is presented. Three major issues are addressed. The first of these is the growing attempt to degrade the function of the person in schooling, both the teacher and the student, by a constant reference to efficiency, input-output analysis, and cost-benefit analysis. The second issue is the tendency to view schools, teachers, and students as part of a national effort to accommodate the process of schooling to the purpose of the industrial community, belying any purpose for schooling other than those related to the profit motive. The final issue concerns itself with the growing politicization and polarization of teachers, students, and administrators about issues that divert attention from a basic examination of purposes, ideals, and goals of education. A brief discussion on the effects of school integration is appended to this paper. (JD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED164328

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marilyn Rauth

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

# TEACHERS, MONEY, AND SCHOOLS

Dr. Vernon Haubrich
Professor of Education
School of Education, University of Wisconsin
Madison, Wisconsin
Member of AFT Local #223

Study made through a research grant by
The American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO
1012 14th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005
April 20, 1973

TEACHERS, MONEY, AND SCHOOLS

## Introduction

For several years now it has been apparent that a frontal attack of nationwide proportions was being directed against American schools. Echoing pronouncements by President Nixon and critics from the extreme left and right, other spokesmen -- even people who should have known better -- began questioning the purpose and function of education. The most massive attack, of course, was the well known study by Christopher Jencks and Associates, Inequality.

The AFT operates on the premise that more education is good for people and good for society and that our schools are our most reliable social institutions. The schools need more money because our society needs more educational service.

In order to develop this thesis, we asked Dr. Vernon Haubrich of the University of Wisconsin to write a review of recent research in this field. Professor Haubrich's study is only the beginning, of course, but it is informative and timeful. I commend it to your attention.

David Selden
President
American Federation of
Teachers, AFL-CIO

TEACHERS, MONEY, AND SCHOOLS

The central issue which confronts educators today is the tendency toward an uncritical acceptance of a particular brand of educational philosophy which connects an industrial, technological society with schools, teachers, and students. At no time, with perhaps the exception of the 1930's when confidence in the society was shaken at every level, in the past 70 or 80 years have educators mounted any campaign of any import, extent or strength to, at least, define the issues, indicate the consequences and perform a much needed definitional effort for school boards, legislatures and, more significantly, for themselves.

It shall be the purpose of this paper to examine the issues which, if kept to themselves may well lead teachers, schools, and children into a kind of society which is neither critical nor compassionate, neither rewarding nor fulfilling, neither meritorious nor democratic.

The first of these issues is the growing attempt to degrade the function of the person in schooling--both the teacher and the student--by a constant reference to efficiency, input-output analysis, and cost-benefit analysis.

The second issue is the tendency to view schools, teachers, and students as part of a national effort to accommodate the process of schooling to the larger purposes of the American Industrial Community. This accommodation belies any purposes for schooling other than those related to the profit motive, a Pax Americana, as well as the subjugation of artistic, ethical, and humane life to growth, efficiency, and dominance.

The third issue concerns itself with the growing politicization and polarization of teachers, students, and administrators about issues which divert attention from a basic examination of purposes, ideals, and goals of schooling

in America. The discussion of career education or efficiency in schooling are, in reality, nothing more than straw man arguments existing as a cover to prevent a searching analysis of the relationship between schools and our democratic social origins.

Let us turn to the first of the issues confronting the profession of teaching--the degrading of the person in the process of schooling.

The touchstone of this movement is the apparently logical demand that more efficiency be gotten from the process of schooling. Usually, glowing references are made to the magnificent efficiency of American enterprise, time and motion studies, or the need for a plus at the bottom of a ledger. Raymond Callahan, in a work often overlooked, has noted this tendency to ape business leaders and their methods. [1] More recently Joel Spring has undertaken a similar analysis of the changing role of education in a corporate state. [2]

A more recent movement has been to enlist the aid of economists, sociologists and the "new" type of administrator in assessing the impact of schooling--with special reference to teachers--on children. It is to this movement that I wish to address some extended remarks, for what we now have is the naive attempt to link statistical methods, analytical techniques, and equational thinking to the assessment of schooling and teachers.

At the outset let me indicate that there are two approaches to the evaluation of teachers. The first is the model frequently used by economists, some sociologists, some psychologists and many professional educators. In its broadest sense this approach is behavioristic in method, design and outlook.

A behaviorists' world is a strange one indeed. He is stuck with a

model of (1.) information recipience, and (2.) predictive output which attempts to connect the two for purposes of prediction, explanation and classification. The behaviorist's model attempts to take the basic model in astronomy or physics and apply it in the field of human endeavor. And therein lies the critical rub. The thing to be predicted--in the jargon of the behaviorists, the dependent variables--are so dependent on such a large number of complicated, independent, interconnected and intervening variables incapable of control, that accuracy in either prediction or explanation, in most cases, is impossible.

The word "impossible" was deliberately used in that the randomness of the variables affecting the thing to be predicted in schooling are so diverse that the researcher cannot even determine them in the context of an item to be predicted. The nature of the predicted variable is itself so complex that if one thinks of extremely fine measures in the field of human concerns, one is struck by the extraordinary complexity of the problem. The issue has been put well by Michael Scriven when he indicates that, "the good fortune of classical physics and the misfortune of psychology lie to a large extent in the kind of prediction problems which they inherit."[3]

What we as union members, teachers, and educators must undertake is a more limited perspective on prediction and control, as well as the explanation of aspects of human behavior in schools and out of schools. We are necessarily limited by the nature of the phenomena with which we are dealing and the context in which fundamental questions can be asked. A much higher degree of modesty is absolutely required as well as a tenativeness about the enterprise of teaching.

In short, the fundamental difficulty with which policy makers, unionists, legislative members and all those concerned with the quality and outcome of public

schooling must eventually deal, is the mentality of necessary and unconditional prediction. What those who judge, appropriate and administer would like are answers regarding teachers, students, achievement levels, where to spend, how to appropriate and the proper emphasis in schooling. What must be the reply of those who are in teaching, schooling and in policy making positions is that the method and language of scientific behaviorism is wholly inappropriate for the task at hand. What is required is a time to reflect on what it is that we wish to have from schools and to apply judicious analysis to the problem. This requires, fortunately, or as the case may be, despairingly, an act of intelligence which all too many are willing to abdicate to the growing army of researchers with computers, regression analyses, and the input-output syndrome.

Perhaps an analogy will be suggestive, even if arguments by analogy can never be conclusive. If the inputs to a newly produced theater play were listed--such as previous experience, skill of direction, quality of playwright, excellence of setting and the outputs were similarly listed--excellent reviews, great box office sales, happy theater goers, and so on--we would have the rudiments of the input-output behavioral model. Up to this point there is little problem with the procedure. What is the problem is the action which reviewers, theater owners, patrons, and others concerned with the play would take in advance of the actual performance. Should this action by "movers and shakers" result in closing the play before a post-hoc judgment by critics and public, a predictive judgment would have been made. In other words, the input-output model would have been employed to effect an action that relied on the predictive capacity of the model.

What, in this example, is necessary for the judgment of the play to be valid is an evaluation by those who review, see, and criticize the play after its

performance. What happens before this post-hoc judgment is that the accumulated wisdom of director, producers, actors, and actresses and all those concerned with the play be brought together by a process called common sense, or insight, or creative organization or whatever the elements of this process include; this may also include intelligence, experience, skill, insight, risk-taking and daring. It is superfluous for me to suggest there are equally eminent human dispositions residing in a teaching situation which is not unconditionally predictable in a scientific sense. These dispositions are artistic and aesthetic in the sense that individual judgement, collective action, and sure-handedness go together. Trust in one self, in one's ability and in the stability of our judgment, are critical to the eventual success of the play. Far more important than the prediction of success is the disposition of experience and knowledge.

Consequently, what is necessary is to consider the claims of the behaviorist and the studies which he has made. For if expenditures, teachers, extra resources and "a host of other variables" mean nothing, than the claims of the input-output cadres of economists, sociologists, and researchers should have the ear of lawmakers, taxation groups, and those who wish to dismantle the public schools. What are the facts as presented by the behavioral experts themselves?

If one reviews over 30 years of work on the effects of expenditures, teachers, socio-economic status and peer group relationships the very best one can say is ". . . that the present rudimentary state of our quantitative models does not permit us to disentangle the effects of home, school, and peers on students' achievement."[4] Additionally, "Until our models become a great deal more sophisticated they will be of very limited use to policymakers and administrators."[5]

The models of which Alexander Mood speaks are precisely the models

which I feel can never be appropriate to the process of teaching, learning, and schooling. Suffice it at this moment that the massive criticism of the Coleman report (See Levin, Moynihan, Bowles, Gutherie, etc.) go to the heart of this matter. The purpose of this paper is not to review in detail these studies, for others have done this in an admirable fashion [6] but rather to indicate the methodological and substantive conflicts which exist in a long trail of these studies.

From the earliest studies (Barr) which employed relatively simple correlational techniques to more recent studies (Mullenkoff, Melville-1956, Goodman 1959, Thomas 1962) which employed large samples and controls for socio-economic status, the centrally crucial finding was that school staff, the quality of student contact with this staff, experience of teachers, volumes in the school library, and salaries of teachers, played a major role in student achievement. A leading economist, Charles Benson, conducted a similar type of study in 1965, which indicates the following:

"The association between achievement of pupils and the instruction offered by their teachers who are qualified by experience and training to be paid in the upper salary quartile is positive, and the association stand independently of the known connection between the home environment of pupils and their achievement." [7] (Benson 1965) (Italics added). Additional studies by Hanuchek, Ribich, and Levin, [8] tends to confirm the overall effect of teacher verbal ability, school expenditures, and years of teaching experience as critical variables in assessing student achievement.

In the face of numerous studies, both in this country and in England (see the Plowden Report 1967,) one must view the conclusion of the Coleman

Report with extreme caution--The Coleman Report states:

"Taking all these results together, one implication stands out above all: That schools bring little influence to bear upon a child's achievement that is independent of his background and general social context; and that this very lack of independent effect means that the inequalities imposed upon children by their home, neighborhood, and peer environment are carried along to become the inequalities with which they confront adult life at the end of school. . . ."[9]

The import of this conclusion and others, (see, for example, Rand Study, 1972) [10] is four-fold:

First, it plays directly into the hand of the tax conservative who wishes to save money at all costs;

Second, it supports the philosophy of the status quo which holds that this world is incapable of change;

Third, it neglects many roles for the school related to integration, vocational education, and education for its own sake;

Fourth, if schooling makes no difference at all a reasonable conclusion may well be let the poor eat cake. Why equalize when it does no good? When members of a research team (Rand 1973) can seriously suggest that large savings could be effected in school financing ("There seems to be opportunities for significant reduction or redirection of educational expenditures without deterioration in educational outcome,"[11]) one is made rather painfully aware that the jargon of an incomplete methodology can be used for whatever purposes one has outside of the research itself. An opposite conclusion could have as easily been drawn

given another set of values and purposes. Consequently, the remainder of this paper will not deal with the 'tis' and 'taint' curiosities of behaviorist researchers, but with a hard look at the state we are in a vis-a-vis the schooling and rearing of our young, and the impact of some crucial social forces on this schooling.

In considering the forces which have helped to create the state we are in one must conclude that the linkeage of individual talent, schooling as a screening device, the rise of a credentialing society, international competition in an industrial, technological sense and the rising interest in the efforts of education in a corporate sense (as opposed to individual self-fulfilment) have created a vastly different sorting, screening and development agency than was ever conceived by Horace Mann. The interest of the Federal Government is well documented (for example, see Schools, People and Money--President's Commission on School Finance) [12] by Commission reports, Congressional hearings, and leaders of industry, defense, and business. The intrusion of the Federal interest to insure certain outputs (science, NSF, math, engineering) is striking testimony to the limited, almost anti-intellectual attitude which relates national and international situations to the productivity of selected fields. Of more recent origin is the career education emphasis of the USOE which declares that the educational system should perform its tasks in relationship to jobs--not enjoyment, pleasure in learning, aesthetic development or whatever--but jobs. All education, K-University, should be so structured. Consider the following:

"The entire school program would be focused around helping the individual student achieve his own self-established career goal." (See pg. 65, President's Commission on School Finance.) Or the following:

"Businessmen are complaining that they cannot get the people they need and students are complaining that they cannot find jobs. The link between the two is supposed to be the educational system." (Ibid., Italics added).

That puts the matter rather baldly, I must say. What schools are to do is nothing less then become the handmaidens of an established industrial, business community. Reasons are not given, except the hidden assumption that what is good for industry is good for children.

Other writers have documented the incessant move on the part of school leaders to ape the business community and to imitate their features of cost-benefit analysis, time and motion study and above all, efficiency in the production of units. The Philadelphia teachers strike (1972-73) is a startling case in point where the calculation of what teachers are paid per hour is viewed in hours, days, length of school year and then simple division gives us the answer. We may not be far from the calculated man whose entire responsibility is looked on as having a relationship to a cost-effectiveness study. All this from the non-union business and industrial community buttressed by legal and quasi-legal supports at each stage of the development.

The remarkable thing about the administrative-technological-managerial mind is its apparent willingness to do almost anything which the business-industrial community wants done. In the jargon of these faceless wonders, administrators have nomethetic roles which are in tune with larger organizational desires. John Dewey once remarked that a highly bureaucratic organization produces a trained incapacity to think, and a lack of thought is just where we are at. Let us think for a moment of the stakes involved in these issues at this time.

First, there is clearly the economic issue, which to P.P.B.S. and input-output personnel is really the paramount issue. No matter the concomitant learnings of schooling, the philosophy, or the value questions--if we can cut budget without measureable harm, then cut we must for a fatter personal wallet.

Secondly, there is the psychological bent of the emerging challenge. Do for yourself if you can, and if you can't, then be sure you get a proper career so to serve larger purposes in the industrial community.

Thirdly, the philosophy of mind and state and the way to rear children within that state is clearly a central issue confronting all of us.

Fourthly, issues pertaining to ideals of desegregation, integration, and equality of opportunity for all children must be considered; and lastly the moral direction of the American community must be considered when we think of the new look in education.

In the context of these concerns, I should like to take a brief research journey with you and share some observations about this research made during the past 15 years. The central focus of my research has been the nature of the fully functioning classroom and school having the usual members such as teacher, principal, student, and auxilliary personnel.

The first finding was the result of four years of research in a series of Harlem Jr. High Schools in the late 50's and early 60's. The staffing of these schools at that time in history was a most difficult task and an ad-hoc program was developed at Hunter College to attempt to prepare beginning teachers for service in these schools. Only volunteers were accepted and a strong internship community knowledge program evolved. [13] The critical finding which we came to

in the four years concerned the character of the teacher who remains in these strange situations and does whatever must be done--who does not run from challenge. This person, as compared with the non-volunteer who elected other experiences, was more open, less rigid, and less authoritarian. Additionally, a pattern of early independence in decision making in family and neighborhood was apparent; a strong independent bent of mind was present. Even more remarkable is the fact that those volunteers constituted only 5% of the student body at Hunter, and consequently, to attempt to find an answer to the nature of the teacher in the fully functioning classroom among such a sample was impossible. Miracles were not to be forthcoming from these young, fresh teachers because of the limited numbers of such teachers having characteristics of independence, openness, and lack of ridgidity. In all fairness, I should add that we were unable to move achievement levels in these schools one iota. Discovery #1: to attribute the success or failure of a school, however defined, exclusively to teachers is to miss whatever point there is.

The second aspect of this continuing research for what constitutes the fully functioning classroom occurred in 1965 with the passage of ESEA. An opportunity presented itself to create a unique summer training session for teachers, administrators, and related educational personnel, such as psychologists, reading teachers, etc. [14] Briefly stated, the objectives of this summer training program were to:

1. Break down the medical model so evident in schools where each practitioner is separated from the other, where the teacher acts as a referal point to many specialists occupying separate offices where "treatments" take place.

2. Involve the school staff with parents of the children who were being taught in the summer program, to enable better communication between teacher and parent on the learning problems of the child and his relationship to the school.

The procedures we employed in the summer program were to get the specialist, such as the psychologist, reading teacher, guidance person, etc., out of his office and into the classroom, where he and the teachers had to work out teaching and learning procedures together. Our reasoning was that the child had first to succeed in the classroom and that the specialist had better make his suggestions in that context and not in his cubicle.

Teams of teachers, specialists, administrators, and consultants engaged in a program of planning, teaching, observing, and evaluating within the school and participating in home visitation.

As most projects seem to report, there was an enthusiasm for the new arrangements; teachers and the related personnel reported a wholly new attitude on their own part toward the students and class activities, and while exactitude of measurements were not possible, the children seemed to enjoy school and schooling to a greater degree than ever before. We had a success.

Luckily, my paranoia was well served when a modest follow-up of the experience was done during the following academic year. Using the focused interview technique, we interviewed teachers, administrators, and specialists involved in the summer program to ascertain the changes which were made following the summer program. What we found was that there was an almost immediate return to the established practices of the school once the school year began. The summer program did not have a champion in the fall and the

procedures developed in the summer program were forgotten when new rules went into effect. Discovery #2: The pervasive effect of school bureaucratic rules and procedures can severely limit the kinds of arrangements, actions, and innovations which teachers and others may wish to initiate.

The final look at the nature of the fully functioning classroom and school took place between 1966 and 1972 when a research team from the University of Wisconsin undertook a comparative and developmental look at the process of desegregation. Success was taken to mean achievement in the traditional sense of the word. Measures were taken in all black schools, all white schools, and integrated schools. Interviews were undertaken, teacher attitudes were measured, and the data analysed. When all the hundreds of computer print outs were looked at, and we earnestly sought some valid and reliable conclusions, there was precious little to report other than that data which related to the total functioning of a school. It became clear to us that while liberal as opposed to authoritarian teachers tended to elicit greater achievement on the part of children, this was not universally true. While social class and section of country played a large part in the chances a child had to achieve in school, there were notable exceptions.

Our conclusions are summarized in the appendix of this report, but I must emphasize one of our finding here. . . . "one clue to the achievement discrepancy between black and white, between North and South and between middle and lower classes is clearly the character of the teaching available to children in black, lower class and Southern schools."

The nature of the teacher, his background, preparation, and attitude, as well as verbal ability, make an enormous difference in how and what children achieve in school. To conclude otherwise is simply to ignore reality.

Discovery #3: The character of the teacher and the total context of the teaching-learning situation provides the clearest clue to the fully functioning classroom and child.

What I should like to state as a concluding argument is based far more on logic and reason than on the empiricism of educational research. In brief, the argument runs like this:

Proposition one: Talent, as a general and/or specific attribute of human beings and as an available resource, clearly makes a difference in the resources, climate, and in the outcomes in the school.

Proposition two: Talented teachers are now and will continue to be in short supply as long as national, state, and local priorities are directed towards other goals, values, and purposes.

Proposition three: To obtain and hold these talented teachers for schools and children requires resources to be expended in selectively greater amounts at critical junctions in the educational process.

Proposition four: These critical junctions include not only the fully functioning classroom, cooperative efforts between home and school, and talented teachers, but the place where teachers are selected and prepared for teaching--the universities and colleges.

Proposition five: Schooling must be viewed in the context of non-material, as well as material benefits to children. Appreciations, values, aesthetics, an enlightened citizenry, and a host of other non-material attributes constitutes the heart of the schools' program.

John Dewey once indicated that all educators could ever do was to provide the conditions to permit learning to proceed and to provide maximum communication between student and student and student and teacher. After this was done and a child would not learn, he simply would not. It is time we recognize in this issue the centrally critical issue of schooling as an opportunity to learn, not a prerequisite to achieve. It means, in effect, that the educational process is a most awesome task. It means, in effect, that the educational process is not to be consigned to the last priority; that we rethink what it is that schools can do in the non-economic, non-measureable areas and that, lastly, the school be viewed as a potent agent to introduce children to a democratic way of life which is both compassionate and critical, intellectual and practical, and which is worthy of our best time and effort; not because there is a payoff for the Pentagon, General Motors, or M.I.T., but simply because the faith we have in the dignity and worth of all men and in our democratic society demands nothing less than the best for all our citizens.

The difficulty of the task is awesome, but the rewards great. For those who wish to undertake such a work, the words of President Kennedy may have some meaning. In speaking of those who must actually do the work and undertake the changes he said,

> The credit belongs to the man who actually is in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood...who knows the great enthusiasm, the great devotions, who spends himself in a worthy cause, who at the best knows at the end the triumph of high achievement, and if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall never be with those timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat.

FOOTNOTES

1. Callahan, Raymond, Education and the Cult of Efficiency, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1962.

2. Spring, Joel, Education and the Rise of the Corporate State, Harper & Row, New York, 1973.

3. Scriven, Michael, "Views of Human Nature," in Behaviorism and Phenomenology, ed., T.W. Wann, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1964.

4. Alexander Mood, "Do Teachers Make a Difference?", in Do Teachers Make a Difference?, United States Office of Education, 1970, p. 6.

5. Ibid. p. 3.

6. Ibid. p. 25-51. James W. Gutherie, "A Survey of School Effectiveness Studies."

7. Ibid. p. 34-35.

8. Ibid. p. 36-51.

9. James E. Coleman, Equality of Educational Opportunity, H.E.W., 1966. p. 325.

10. Rand Corporation, How Effective is Schooling?, Santa Monica, 1972.

11. Ibid. p. 155

12. President's Commission on School Finance, 1972.

13. Haubrich, Vernon "Teachers in Big City Schools," in Passow, A. Harry, ed., Education in Depressed Areas, Teachers College Press, New York, 1963.

14. Haubrich, Vernon, The Westchester Report, National Society on the Advanced Study of Disadvantaged Youth, Washington, D.C. 1968.

## APPENDIX

After six years with schools, teachers, administrators, children, parents, computer experts, statisticians and one's own perception of the context of this study, it is difficult not to become philosophical and quite general regarding the process and results of desegregation. The central question of why desegregation seems to "work" in some communities rather than in others is a question which requires some insight into issues regarding racial composition of schools, social class of students, attitudes of teachers and the "zeitgeist" of community feeling.

After all the tests, interviews and analyses what one recalls most vividly are seemingly minor incidents in the study but which one is compelled to describe. In Southern community (I-S) it was apparent that the blacks in the integrated school had scored much higher in the retest situation than had the blacks in the all white school. The whites had also scored higher on the retest in the integrated school. What one discovered in examining the context of the school and community was that the integration of the school had taken place and that the families of the children, both white and black, had no place to run. The classic resegregation of schools which was occurring in many communities because of contiguous neighborhoods which offered a temporary haven to those who wished to flee, simply was not available. The community was in a semi-rural area although attached to a larger administrative unit. There was no nearby areas where people could run and a long range move was out of the question because the community was heavily lower and working class. The community was forced to integrate and to attempt to make it work. The central issue for our research was why the community made it work. After some interviews with both blacks and whites it became apparent that in group meetings before the act of integration, blacks who had met separately

to consider the issue, made an extreme point of instructing their children "not to make trouble", to "follow the law" and then see what would happen.

In addition to the community meetings which were held by whites and blacks, this particular school had a principal who enforced the distribution of the black students among the various classes in a totally random fashion. His own demeanor, professionalism and humanity gave a sense of trust to the black community and especially the black children. His staff, while embracing a relatively conservative position, was impressed with the necessity to get on with the job of making the school year a productive one for the children. Individual remediation projects were undertaken by teachers and by 1970 one black teacher had been added to the staff.

Clearly a combination of factors, the inability to run from a desegregated situation, the insistence on the part of the black community that this situation would work, the fundamental humanity of the principal, and finally, the absolute insistence on the part of the staff to get on with the job of teaching, lent an air of school-community expectation to the desegregation process which helped to make it work. No amount of figures, even though the figures are there, no elegant regression models, even though these exist, no comparisons, even though comparisons have been made, adequately tell this type of story.

## Empirical Findings

The summary of our overall data must be viewed in the context of the sample selection. We deliberately asked for and received a sample of students from average achieving schools and classrooms in each of the communities. We

wanted to do a working and lower class study and to have a sufficient number of middle class children against which to check our findings. This we accomplished.

In the context of this sample selection, our overall data indicates what many researchers have indicated over time. The middle class achieves more than the lower class. In addition we find that the Northern school children achieve more than the Southern school children and that whites achieve more than blacks. This type of aggregate data indicates the basic agreement of the study with other studies of social class, region of country and race. Consequently, our findings on the differential achievements of children with varying types of teachers should be considered significant. Even though our aggregate data supports much of the previous findings, when the children do differ from these kinds of expectations, it is apparent that the attitudes of teachers makes a great deal of difference in the children's achievement.

Again, in the context of our sample selection, we find that teachers are extremely poor predictors of students' ability and that students themselves are excellent predictors of their own abilities. In fact, if one were to take our results as typical, one could derive a ranking of children by merely asking them to rank themselves in the classroom.

Our regression model yielded a model of decrements which flowed from Northern middle class whites to Southern lower class blacks. Given an intersect on the regression line beginning with the white, middle class northern child of 117.1776 we begin a descent which looks as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| White Middle Class North | 117.1776 |
| White Middle Class South | 111.03 |
| Black Middle Class North | 109.6176 |
| White Working Class North | 105.2383 |
| Black Middle Class South | 103.47 |
| White Lower Class North | 102.2522 |
| White Working Class South | 99.01 |
| White Lower Class South | 96.024 |
| Black Working Class North | 94.8832 |
| Black Lower Class North | 91.8972 |
| Black Working Class South | 88.655 |
| Black Lower Class South | 85.699 |

In short, there is a penalty to students who are black, live in the south and come from the working or lower classes. However, and this must be emphasized most strongly, the total amount of variance which can be accounted for amounts to only 30% of the total variance among the score of the students.

The matter of the authoritarian nature of teachers and the depressing influence they have on the Achievement-IQ of children has a corrolary in the results from the WISCAR test administered during the program. This test was designed to get at the variation in the responses of children from black, white and integrated schools to a series of cartoons in which racially different situations were presented. The dominant finding from the study lies in the effect of integrated vs. black and white classrooms. Children's likes and dislikes for classmates as expressed by "Whom does the teacher like/dislike," as well as "Whom do the children like/dislike" are strongly affected by the race of the teacher. Children see the teacher as positively biased towards children of her own race and negatively biased towards children of the opposite race; what is even more revealing is that the race of the teacher seems also to control whom children like/dislike in exactly the same fashion. No matter the racial composition of the classroom, the race of the teacher influences the like/dislike patterns which children express. Children are more likely to express likes for black children when the teacher is black; for

whites when the teacher is white.

In similar fashion, the type of classroom chosen by children, when confronted with predominantly black classroom and black teacher to predominantly white classroom with white teacher, is heavily influenced by the actual classroom setting in which children find themselves. Black children coming from segregated black classrooms are 5 times more likely to pick a predominantly black classroom and teacher than similar children in an integrated situation. An integrated education for children produces effects which reflect an integrated series of choices on the part of these children; a segregated education (for both blacks and whites) produces choices which express a far greater preference for the segregated classroom and teacher.

One most significant finding is the striking difference in the Achievement-IQ scores of children who have conservative as opposed to liberal teachers as measured by the Christie Form of the California Personality Scale, commonly referred to as the F scale. Our range of decrements accorded to children who have conservative as opposed to liberal teachers has a range of 5-40 achievement points! In this connection it is important to note that the moderate teacher who falls in scores between the conservative and liberal teacher is much more akin to the liberal teacher than to the conservative teacher. Consequently, it is the conservative teacher who has a depressing effect, on the whole, rather than the liberal teacher who elevates the scores of children.

It is important to note the possibility of a classic test score pattern which may need additional investigation. Most researchers have noted the difference between black and white children, between North and South, and between middle and lower classes. What this study indicates is that a great deal

of the difference which seems to reside in the race, social class or region of the country, may indeed be accounted for by the nature of the teacher who is assigned or who simply finds himself with black, lower class children living in the South. These teachers are significantly more authoritarian than the teacher who is teaching in the North with white middle class or lower class children.

What is one to say given the data related to achievement, teachers, community findings and the process of desegregation? First and foremost is the influence of the teacher within the classroom situation. His or her training, background, attitude, intellectual ability and flexibility is of paramount importance in the achievement of the child in the classroom. Given a series of authoritarian teachers who would teach a child over a six year period, it is not difficult to visualize a more or less permanent damage and decrement in Achievement-IQ which could influence the perception of other teachers who read his "record." Given, in addition, the fact that these teachers are more likely than not to be teaching in black, segregated schools in the South and where, because of tradition, local superintendents are likely to continue to assign such teachers to black, segregated schools, it is not too difficult to see why it is that a self-fulfilling prophesy begins to emerge for children caught in a web which is not of their own making.

The process of achievement, like the process of desegregation needs much greater explanation, investigation and resolution before we can fully comprehend the impact of a racist and segregationist society of the life of a black child in the South or North, but is apparent that one clue to the achievement discrepancy between black and white, between North and South, and between middle and lower classes is clearly the character of the teaching available to

children in black, lower class and Southern schools. Overcoming these handicaps ought not to be the job of parents and children alone; in the same sense that overcoming disease and pestilence ought not to be the job of parents and children alone. The profession of teaching and administration has the responsibility of recognizing these findings and further, to begin to undertake the job of selection, recruitment, retraining and education of teachers to provide the full measure of educational benefits which children in our society deserve.